

**Council of Chief Academic Officers
Meeting Minutes
January 15, 2014**

In Attendance

Brent Bates
Glenn Coltharp
Deborah Curtis
Douglas Dunham
Arlen Dykstra
Steven Graham
Sherry McCarthy
Don Weiss
Vicki Schwinke
Mindy Selsor
Dwyane Smith
Wes Payne
Rusty Monhollon
Elizabeth Valentine

State Fair Community College
Crowder College
University of Central Missouri
Northwest Missouri State University
Missouri Baptist University
University of Missouri System
William Woods University
Devry University
Linn State Technical College
Jefferson College
Harris-Stowe State University
Three Rivers Community
MDHE
MDHE

Absent

David Russell MDHE

I. Call to Order

A. Welcome

Rusty called the meeting to order and thanked everyone for their attendance.

II. Updates and Reports

A. Minutes: October 2013 Meeting

There were no additional comments or corrections to the October minutes and so they were considered approved.

B. Educator Preparation Accountability

Rusty mentioned that MDHE met with DESE in November. The ensuing discussion involved DESE agreeing to collaborate and ensure that something of this sort would not occur again, and legislation will most likely be filed so as to ensure that this does

not occur again. There was a suggestion of a joint advisory council between Higher Education and K-12. Rusty recently crafted such a group, which would consist of 10 members from Higher Education and 10 members from DESE. Representative Thompson is ready with the proposed legislation, and we are currently waiting to see if that proposal is satisfactory. Doug Dunham mentioned that Mike Thompson needs to have something with some teeth in it, and needs something that will undoubtedly work for higher education. There has to be something that will commit DESE to collaboration with Higher Education.

Rusty then guided the council members into a discussion about where they think we should all go from here, what is the best course of action.

Doug Dunham wants to ensure that higher education is directly involved in all conversations that may ensue relating to changing the general education curriculum. How are people handling the changes in the sciences and math in order to correspond to MoGEA? Steve mentioned that there will be other courses created, new core courses of a survey nature to meet the MoGEA assessment. This will be somewhat tailored to those teacher preparation students. For the two years institutions, there are concerns regarding the general education curriculum and also how much teeth this change/policy will have. Rusty mentioned that MDHE does not want to take on the responsibility of educator preparation, but what we do want is some mechanism that forces the higher education voice to be heard. The timeline is also still an issue for higher education institutions, and many are concerned that DESE does not understand this. MACTE and MACE are two advisory councils over DESE; both have higher education council on them. Steve mentioned that we have seen evidence that an advisory or consultative entity does not really have much of an impact. As long as DESE has sole authority we may not get where we want to be in the end.

Rusty mentioned that it take some legislation or an agreement between the two agencies to get anywhere. A joint decision made between CBHE/SBE may be what is necessary. Perhaps there could be joint CBHE/SBE meetings. SBE has long not been very collaborative, however. Program accreditation is where we truly want to be involved, not teacher certification. There may then need to be some type of joint approval. This would mean that whatever change DESE is trying to administer would need to be approved by CBHE first before it is approved by SBE and then implemented. Rusty mentioned that DESE's concern is that if legislation is introduced, it would open the conversation for the two agencies to be merged in some way.

C. HB 1042 Implementation

Regarding the **Core Transfer Library**, the board was to approve 16 courses in the transfer library in December; however, that meeting was cancelled due to lack of quorum. The transfer library is up for the February board meeting, so there will be 20 courses approved in February. The following courses will hopefully be approved in April and all must be approved by June. We still have 10 courses that need to be added and approved by the CBHE.

The **Developmental Education initiative** is currently working to fully implement the statewide placement policy. Also, Paul Long and Donna Dare have put forth a Summit on Mathematics to look at alternate pathways in mathematics courses. This summit will most likely take place near the fall semester. Steve mentioned some extra money from UM system that could be used, and Rusty mentioned a \$15,000 grant from College Readiness Partnership from MDHE that could be used as well to reinvent and redesign math courses and math pathways.

Regarding the **Reverse Transfer Initiative**, only 16 institutions submitted sub-grant proposals. Some of those were out of scope, however. So far, \$117-118,000 will be doled out among the institutions whose proposals were approved. There is a good amount of money leftover, and discussions have been had about what to do with the leftover money. There have been conversations about a second sub-grant opportunity, or to use the money for a TES system that will accelerate XML transcripts among institutions. It creates a central location where all institutions can then transfer their data. It makes it much more efficient for the institutions. There is an annual subscription cost, however, the total dollar amount has yet to be determined. It appears that the initial cost may be around \$240,000, and with 40 institutions needing to sign up with TES, that's about \$6,000 per institution. Registrars seem to think that \$6,000 was a small amount to get this kind of efficiency. One thing to also keep in mind is the need to also incorporate the transfer library, and the TES system would allow institutions to do that. Rusty asked the council members if they felt that we should pursue this and if institutions would likely participate? Rusty mentioned that we want to do this as a state, making it available to the public and independent institutions. Another appealing aspect about the TES system is that it is very efficient in degree auditing.

Rusty felt that the council members were in agreement and would be willing to pursue the TES system and at a statewide level.

D. State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA)- Midwest SARA

Leroy passed around the sample legislation for participation in the MSARA agreement. The legislation essentially empowers the coordinating board as the portal agency, which will make it responsible for SARA. In addition, it provides the

authority to do whatever is necessary to meet the requirements of the SARA agreement. The plan is to move forward with the legislation. Leroy is working with MSARA so that all institutions can come together from all sectors and discuss what is going on and what this will look like across the sectors and regions. This meeting will be sometime in February. They will discuss the approval process in terms of what is required for them to be approved, etc.

There are several issues as part of this as well. Leroy mentioned that one of the requirements relates to the financial responsibility of the institutions. They use the federal financial responsibility score... Full participation is 1.5, and states can determine if the institutions are between 1.0 and 1.5, whether they can participate and are financially responsible. Independent institutions have raised concerns as to how this score is calculated. Efforts are now aimed at figuring out how it is calculated and whether it is appropriate to use. The second issue relates to the complaint process. Missouri has a complaint process, but it is not clear what the SARA agreement will require in terms of do we have enough, etc. We will then need to work through what is adequate and what is not. The third issue is about disaster recovery. What happens to students when institutions close, or if an institution decides that they are no longer going to participate? Do they transfer them, reimburse them, etc? The regional compact has not thoroughly discussed this, and eventually this discussion will need to be had.

Leroy mentioned that it will be fall of this year before everything is sorted through and Missouri is ready to go. The national executive directors want 40-45 states by 2016 participating. We are early in the process, however, and more issues will undoubtedly arise. North Dakota and Nebraska have statutes in place currently. Michigan and Wisconsin are at the other end of the process. Michigan does not really have a statewide entity that would fall into the portal place, so they are figuring out who that body may be. Other states are still working through getting legislation crafted and then introduced into the legislature. There are currently no states that have outright said no they will participate.

There are no anticipated obstacles regarding the legislation that has been introduced this legislative session in Mo. Rusty expressed to the council members that he will relay any and all information to them regarding MSARA and the recently introduced legislation.

E. Follow-up to Statewide Program Review

We have heard back from all of the institutions, except for one, but are more or less finished with the program review. 12 programs have been deleted, 4 have been inactivated and the rest have used justification as critical to mission, supports other

programs, etc. Elizabeth Valentine's plan is to have those complete and ready to report at the February board meeting. Worst case, there may need to be a follow up at the April board meeting. There may need to be an annual review, not exactly like the one that has just recently been conducted, but to ensure that programs are working and have been efficient, etc. There was agreement among the council members that the program review is helpful and that it should continue in some capacity.

Rusty mentioned that he will try to craft some models that we may want to consider employing in terms of the program review.

F. Multistate Consortium to Advance Learning Outcomes Assessment (MSC)

Missouri is one of the 9 states participating, and we have funding from the Gates Foundation. Not sure how much of that funding will be for MO specifically. We have to identify 3 community colleges and 3 four-year institutions to participate. All institutions in MO willing to participate will be provided with the guidelines, etc in order to follow along with the consortium.

III. Old Business

A. Courses in U.S/MO Constitution and History

The policy has been interpreted by the MDHE that institutions must offer these courses, but that no institution is necessarily bound to require these students to take these courses. The council was in agreement that this new language was appropriate and agreed that it should be taken to the board for approval at the February board meeting.

IV. New Business

A. CBHE Public Policies Review

- 1. Dual Credit/ Early College*: The primary goal of this effort is to do everything we possibly can to ensure quality of dual credit programs statewide. We need to keep this in mind as the overall objective. Rusty mentioned that Crystal Kroner is heading up this policy change and will be working diligently over the next several months to get this off the ground and the early college workgroup up and running again.

Rusty discussed with the council members that we need to create an atmosphere where dual credit programs are more innovative. You must monitor quality, however, by going out into the high school and observing and monitoring the dual credit program. The dual credit policy as it stands now is severely outdated. It needs and will be revamped to include other types of early college, e.g. dual enrollment, etc. Do we require another agency or do we require NACEP accreditation? Hopefully this will be ironed out during this process. Rusty mentioned that we are more than likely going to need to create some type of dual credit council that will observe and ensure that institutions are conducting dual credit programs correctly. As part of this policy review process, MDHE staff will create and refer to a dual credit crosswalk with HLC and NACEP guidelines and how well our current policy is doing compared to these standards.

B. CBHE Public Policies Review

Rusty is going to introduce an agenda item at the February board meeting that discusses the rationale and method of how we will go about cleaning up our policies. Many of them need to be simply cleaned up or corrected, however, some may simply not be needed anymore. We will then bring those revised policies into this council for review and vetting before being sent out to the entire CAO community for further comment before it will go to the CBHE for approval. The policies that we will start with include:

1. Mission and Selectivity
2. Lower-Division Coursework/Associate Degrees
3. Academic Program Review
4. Off-Campus sites

C. 2014 Legislative Session Preview

HB 1232 Show Me Future program – modeled somewhat after Pay it Forward in Oregon. It is being driven by the general feeling of tuition being too high and students going further into debt. It's a conversation about tuition and fees not the cost of attendance as a whole. It does not necessarily do anything really about the debt, it just changes the conversation. It creates an incentive to not create their programs that are lower paying jobs. If your funding source is reliant on high paying jobs, then what about those lower paying school programs? Those in the high end of pay at the end of college end up subsidizes the lower paying college careers. We aren't sure how this will play out, but it is a continuing conversation. While it might not just disappear, it most likely will not be passed this legislative session.

HB 1308 – expand Bright Flight by including loan forgiveness program. The program would continue as is, but then those students who have the option to take out a forgivable loan

would be forgiven if they work in MO after college graduation for a certain amount of time. For example, a four year loan means you may have to work in MO for four years.

HB 1247 – requires DESE to establish a procedure to reimburse students involved in dual credit if you are an A+ student.

HB 1279 – expands A+ to include ALL students in Missouri. That it includes private high schools means it may be the end of it, there is not much interest in expanding it to private high schools.

SB 514 - Common Core bill will get its day, but it is unlikely to see much traction.

There may then be more legislation come out soon, perhaps regarding developmental education. We will also know more about the budget this year after next Tuesday and the State of the State speech. Rusty told the council members that they can contact him for any further information regarding this legislative session or can contact Leroy Wade.

D. Statewide Mathematics Summit

Refer to section II, C for this discussion.

V. Big Issues

A. Competency-Based Education

Rusty asked council members whether they would like to begin the process of integrating competency based education into some of their programs in an effort to reduce financial/academic burdens on students? Most of the council members were on board with starting serious conversations regarding implementing competency-based education at more institutions. One thing that may be essential is some professional development for the faculty so that the fear they may have regarding competency-based education is mitigated. There may need to be some type of statewide convening of faculty to inform them and generate buy-in in terms of advancing the competency-based agenda.

Steve then began a discussion regarding some type of faculty fellowship opportunity where faculty are assisted financially in some way while they research and come up with various innovative models of competency based education to exercise on Missouri campuses. Steve mentioned UM system has some extra money that could potentially be used for this purpose. He thought the financial assistance could help faculty with expenses, research support, travel time to conferences, etc. It would need to be some type of faculty fellowship that would assist in advancing competency-based models at institutions in the state, however. Rusty also mentioned that there may be some MDHE funding (\$15,000 from a certain grant) as well as foundational funding to get this started.

Steve then gave the example that a professor may choose to go on sabbatical to assist in this type of initiative, and the output then is further advancing competency-based education at MO

institutions as opposed to another research paper, etc. It is important to remember that the focus of this type of faculty fellowship is innovation in competency-based education and coming up with what would work well for various institutions in Missouri. Both the MDHE and the council need to thoroughly discuss what the initial effort here will be, and what exactly would the charge be for these folks and how many do we want involved? It needs to be some type of network of folks who are most likely already working on these types of ideas. Individuals involved in the MACE Initiative and the Redesign Scholars could be some of the faculty we may want to start with or reach out to initially. There will definitely need to be some type of dissemination to other institutions as well. It was also asked if we should we include other staff, such as registrars, in this type of fellowship? Rusty mentioned that MDHE staff will work on these ideas and then share whatever information we have in the meantime before the April council meeting.

B. *The Future of Distance Education*

VI. Announcements

A. *Next CCAO Meeting*

The next CCAO meeting will be held on April 16, 2014 at the Governor's Office Building in room 460.

B. *Other Meetings of interest/note*

Other meetings of interest include:

COTA Transfer Conference – January 29

TCCR – January 28

CBHE – February 6

TCCR – February 21

CCA – February 28

TCCR – March 7

CBHE – April 3

VII. Adjournment